



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,260	07/24/2003	Sidney M. Weiser	SYN.P.US0039	9583

26360 7590 01/30/2006

RENNER, KENNER, GREIVE, BOBAK, TAYLOR & WEBER
FIRST NATIONAL TOWER FOURTH FLOOR
106 S. MAIN STREET
AKRON, OH 44308

EXAMINER

RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/626,260

Applicant(s)

WEISER ET AL.

Examiner

Ula C. Ruddock

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 21, 2005, has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added limitation of a mat "for placement on top of soil" and multi-dimensional fibers "providing a more entangled fiber layer than non-woven mats comprising one-dimensional polymer fibers, to break up the flow and energy of water passing over the soil" is considered to be new matter. The specification fails to disclose this subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohannon, Jr. (US 6,855,650) in view of Lancaster (US 5,849,645) and Freed (US 5,326,192). Bohannon, Jr. discloses a synthetic fiber filled erosion control blanket. The netting and loose fiber filler construction permits blankets or mats of this kind to be fairly light in weight and also to permit the ingrowth of grasses and other vegetation into and through the blanket. The netting primarily serves to hold the loose fiber filler together (col 1, ln 56-61). It should be noted that the Examiner is equating the fiber filler of Bohannon, Jr. to the nonwoven mat of the present invention. The top and bottom sheets generally resemble an open-mesh material or netting and the filler material for use in the erosion control blanket is made up of a plurality of crimped polymer fibers which form a three-dimensional matrix between the top sheet and the bottom sheet. The filler material can be made of polyethylene terephthalate (col 2, ln 44-57). The netting is formed of polyethylene, polypropylene, or other suitable polyolefin (col 3, ln 56-59). The PET fibers of the fiber filler have a denier size of about 15-500 (col 5, ln 1-2) and a length of 5.75-6.25 inches (col 6, ln 61-64). The top and bottom sheets are stitched together (col 6, ln 61-62). Bohannon, Jr. discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching that the layers are stitched with a polymer yarn and that the mat comprises multi-dimensional polymer fibers.

Freed (US 5,326,192) discloses a method for the improvement of appearance and performance characteristics of turf surfaces. The reinforcing material include fibers, such as olefins, that have rectangular, square, or multi-lobal cross-sectional configurations to further enhance soil cohesion (col 3, ln 43-53 to col 4, ln 1-13).

Lancaster (US 5,849,645) discloses a reinforced composite matting used for environmental soil erosion control (col 6, ln 28-29). The composite matting includes a bottom netting, fiber matrix, top netting that are secured together by stitching strands made of polyester black thread, thereby sandwiching and trapping the fiber matrix materials there between (col 5, ln 22-32).

It would have been obvious to have used the multi-lobal fibers of Freed and the polyester stitching thread of Lancaster in the erosion control blanket of Bohannon, Jr., motivated by the desire to create an erosion control blanket that increased soil-cohesion and increased structural integrity.

With regard to Applicant's newly added limitation disclosing that the mat is placed on top of the soil, it should be noted that it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987). Therefore, because the combination of Bohannon, Jr., Lancaster, and Freed discloses the claimed invention, the material can also be used on top of the soil, as required by the present invention.

Rejection is maintained.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed December 21, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth. It should be noted that Applicant's arguments are based upon the present amendments which were not disclosed in the specification and are therefore considered new matter. Applicant first argues that their placement of the mat differs from the placement of material disclosed by the combination of the Bohannon, Jr., Lancaster, and Freed

references. This argument is not persuasive because, as shown above, because Bohannon, Jr., Lancaster, and Freed disclose the structural requirements of the present invention, their material can also be used on top of the soil. Applicant also argues that Freed's multi-lobed fibers must be buried. This argument is not persuasive because Freed specifically discloses that their fibers are used for the improvement of appearance and performance characteristics of turf surfaces (abstract). Therefore, Freed's fibers are not necessarily buried in the soil. Applicant further argues the combination of Bohannon and Freed. This argument is not persuasive because Bohannon is used for erosion control and Freed is used for turf reinforcement and anchoring. Therefore, all rejections have been maintained.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ula C. Ruddock whose telephone number is 571-272-1481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H. Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UCR




Ula C. Ruddock
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 1700